

which I compare to the rational and the intelligent alternatives that did not include the lower Taunton River. And, in fact, in this so-called second version that has now become part of this bill, the report said it was problematic that there is no precedent for this kind of action, no precedent for this kind of action, but it does meet political expectations.

Let me give a third reason, and yes indeed, this is an energy reason. The potential LNG port which would be put in Weaver's Cove would have been the largest taxpaying entity. And it was not agreed to to move on so far, but it has not been stopped. This project is still viable until the year 2015. This bill, if passed, is the only way to permanently make this a moot issue.

This language is the language of the report, which simply meant that the current proposal was to be rejected but that they encouraged an additional proposal to try and work out the situational problems to be encouraged. And they gave them the time to do that. The actual report encourages them to review this issue one more time. So it is true that this issue of an LNG port is still on the table. And the only way it can be permanently taken off the table is by passage of this type of bill.

Now why would that impact me because I live in Utah and I really don't care about this river all that much? It is simply because one of the members of the delegation came down on the floor this morning and said that last year 350,000, according to his numbers, individuals in the State of Massachusetts had to be given subsidies under LIHEAP, paid by all the taxpayers of the Nation, because they did not have the ability to handle the energy crisis within their State and that, indeed, heat was not something that was negotiable. However, the problem is, why don't we simply solve the problem by providing the energy there so that you don't have to tell the citizens of Massachusetts to freeze in the dark but solve the problem yourselves?

There was an interesting discussion on the floor during the rule which the gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, was criticized for not having LNG ports in his home State. I wish to simply respond that it was a factual accuracy that has total irrelevance to the issue, because Washington State does not need LNG ports. It has gas pipelines. The entire West is provided by gas pipelines that do not reach to the eastern coast. The only way Massachusetts can step up and solve their own problem is by having not fewer but more LNG ports. That is the only option that is left to them. And this bill does inhibit that particular option.

Now with that are only three of the many reasons why this bill should not be passed, why this bill is poor public policy, why this bill does abuse the statute and change the meaning of the words that were intended for a wild and scenic river, why this bill does disrespect to this body and how we de-

cided to try and do this study in the first place by ignoring the will of Congress and ignoring the authorization and appropriation of Congress and going off on some other particular way. And it does stop any potential improvements of an LNG port on this river which is desperately needed in that part of the country.

Those are only three of the possible reasons. There are others. I'm sure we will hear from those others as this discussion continues on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Just one point of clarification before I recognize the sponsor of the legislation is the issue with the LIHEAP reference. LIHEAP doesn't address the ability to get energy. It creates a situation where people can afford to buy energy.

With that, let me introduce the distinguished Congressman from the Commonwealth, Mr. FRANK, the sponsor of the legislation, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by regretting the animus toward the people we represent that we've just heard. The gentleman from Utah said, "Wild and scenic. The only thing wild about this are the gangs there." The city of Fall River, the gentleman has an amendment that would exempt from this bill the city of Fall River, Massachusetts, a city full of working people, many of them immigrants who became American citizens, and their descendants, from Portugal and elsewhere, people who worked in the garment industry and the textile industry, a city which has suffered economically the fate of de-industrialization.

Characterizing them and saying "The only thing scenic about them is their graffiti, the only thing wild about them is their gangs," they don't deserve that denigration, no matter what political points people want to score. If you want to come after me, if you want to come after Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island or Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, we'll deal with it. But please don't denigrate these hardworking people. Don't impute to them gang activity that doesn't exist. The gentleman who accused them of gang activity has no idea of what goes on there and he makes an inaccurate statement.

The only thing scenic is the graffiti? Is that not scenic? This is the Battleship *Massachusetts*. It's part of a national park. It's one of the few battleships that comes with a Patriot missile, because I got Raytheon to put it up there. It's a park, a park for patriotic people. Do you see any graffiti on the Battleship *Massachusetts*?

In fact, that is part of the problem here. Apparently we're told it's okay to have a wild and scenic river. And of course we're not saying it should be wild and scenic. We are talking about a part of the statute that says you can have recreation. And these are people who have decided that in part because they have lost their industrial base

that they had for a variety of reasons, they will develop new economic activity that is based on their river.

By the way, one of the bridges that is talked about, one of these structures, we have gotten money to take down. Like a number of cities that walled themselves off from the river, Fall River has appreciated the great beauty and attractiveness of that waterfront. And they would like to tear it down.

But here is the issue. Is environmentalism only for suburbanites? Do working people who have found themselves in economic distress have no right to try and enhance the quality of their environment?

Let me have some more of those pictures down here. Let me have some more to show people what we are talking about. We are not talking about only what was pictured.

This is part of the area that would be banned from the bill under the gentleman from Utah's amendment. So is this. Part of it is Mr. MCGOVERN's district. Part of it is my district. It impacts the other districts. Yes, it is not everywhere beautiful. These are people who haven't had the good fortune to live always in land that was so attractive. But they would like to try and improve their situation. They would like to be able to enhance the quality of their environment without being denigrated as gang members or graffitiists. Yes, there are a few people who do graffiti. The overwhelming majority in every single community along this river on both sides has asked for this designation. It was begun by our late and beloved colleague Joe Moakley before anybody heard of LNG. By the way, on LNG, there is an LNG plant in the district of our colleague, Mr. MARKEY. We in the Massachusetts delegation overwhelmingly supported a second LNG plant just a little bit offshore, just north of Boston that has been approved. Many of us support a third one. It is not a case of rejecting LNG. And I notice that people on the other side, those who think Fall River is just full of graffiti artists and gang members and don't know that wonderful city and the decent, patriotic people who live there, they circulated an editorial from the Boston Herald saying this isn't needed. And the Herald editorial, the op-ed piece that they circulated, concluded by saying, of course, it's not necessary because the LNG plant is dead. It's not simply the current LNG plant that has been rejected. It was the Coast Guard saying that in that narrow waterway, with the bridges that have to be traversed, you can't do it.

Carlos Gutierrez said "no," the Secretary of Commerce. I've got to say, I didn't know that I would be defending the Bush administration so much here. I know I will be defending them against the Republicans on the questions of the housing bill. But we were also told there was this terrible conspiracy with the Park Service under George Bush. I don't think the Interior Department

under President Bush was engaged in this kind of chicanery that has been imputed to them.

We are talking about the desire of people who live in an area that has some industrial activity, but some residential and recreational areas, who want to protect what they have and make it better. They have asked us, and we have worked with them, to tear down an elevated highway. We are working with them to enhance the quality of their environment in a way that will also improve things economically. Every Member of Congress whose district is remotely near here strongly supports this bill. Every city and town along the way supports this. Every elected legislator and local official supports it. For them to be told essentially that "it's too gritty, it's too grubby, you aren't people who we had in mind when we talked about the beauties of the environment, you don't deserve this because you've had graffiti and some of you belong to gangs"—an inaccurate characterization of the whole city—to deny them that is I think a degree of cruelty, frankly, that I hope this House does not encompass.

I and others have tried very hard to take into account what other Members think about their districts. To repudiate what all of the Members of Congress, five of us very directly involved here, think would be important for this particular area because an LNG plant that has been rejected by the Department of Commerce and by the Coast Guard and cannot be resuscitated, might some day in 10 years be resuscitated, and by then we will have had enough other LNG plants that it wouldn't even have any demand probably, that these people should be told, just the 9 miles, conveniently, the city of Fall River, the urban area, the area of hardworking immigrants who became American citizens, that they should be told that they don't qualify for environmental protection is a decision that I hope this House would not make.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from West Virginia for the consideration they have given. It may in part be relevant that these are Members who themselves understand the desire of working people, of people who have lived in these kinds of areas, to get the same kind of consideration for their environmental needs as wealthy suburbanites.

I hope that the bill is passed without amendments that would cripple it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate very much the gentleman from Massachusetts standing up to defend his constituency. It is the right thing to do. It is the proper thing for him to do. It is his job and purpose. But once again, I want him to focus in on the reality of the situation, which is not the quality of the individuals in Massachusetts. It is simply the issue at hand. This, by the way, is that same battleship—assuming there should be a battleship in a wild and scenic river zone—this is the

same battleship from the other angle which is decidedly less pristine and much more urbanized.

But the issue at hand that the gentlemen on the other side need to deal with is that the purpose of the act is for preservation, not rehabilitation, not for economic development, which are the very words that were just used. That is not what the Wild and Scenic River Act was ever intended to do. And that is what is going to be done in this particular bill. That is why we are abusing the vocabulary of the Wild and Scenic River Act. And we must focus back in on what we are doing. Indeed, the proposed LNG port is in an existing brownfield, zoned for maritime industrial use. But the issue is for what purpose are the verbs and the nouns in the Wild and Scenic River Act supposed to be implied? And does it apply to the lower Taunton? And the answer is simply "no." It doesn't meet the definition.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, unless, Mr. Chairman, you would like us to reserve and then come back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do rise in strong opposition to this bill, H.R. 415, a bill to designate parts of the lower Taunton River in Massachusetts as part of the National Wild and Scenic River system, especially, Mr. Chairman, in a time when American families are paying \$4.11 for a gallon of gasoline.

The gentleman, the author of the bill that just spoke and his colleagues from the Bay State, I will give them the fact that they want to do things for the lower Taunton and the citizens of their district that live on either side of that river. But this really, in my opinion, doesn't quite pass the smell test.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

□ 1730

Mr. MCGOVERN. Two questions. One is how does LNG reduce the price of gasoline at the pump for the average citizen? And two, how many LNG facilities do you have in Georgia? I think it is one. We have two up and running in Massachusetts and a third one permitted, so don't lecture us about not doing our part in addressing the energy crisis.

Mr. GINGREY. Reclaiming my time, basically in response to my friend from Massachusetts, it is the same response that my colleague from Utah made in reference to the gentleman from Washington State when this same argument came up during the discussion of the rule.

But as the gentleman from Utah points out, the whole purpose of this act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, was not for redevelopment. And I heard

the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) just talk about tearing down a highway, an elevated highway to make this area more scenic. I would like my colleagues to focus in on this poster of the lower Taunton River and see how unscenic it is. It may be wild, but it is certainly not scenic.

This act was never designed for redevelopment and for tearing down bridges and highways. This is not the time to do that. Clearly, this is not a wild and scenic river and doesn't meet that designation.

I would like to continue, Mr. Chairman, and say that when the Natural Resources Committee held hearings on this bill, representatives from the National Park Service testified that this area would be the most industrialized river ever to be given this designation.

Along the shoreline of the Taunton River, you can find a hair salon, a shipyard, a port area, and yes, even a McDonald's. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know about you, but I don't see anything that is scenic about this industrialized area.

Furthermore, as a result of this designation, this Congress would prevent future development along the river and would therefore prohibit the proposed use of the Taunton River as a terminal for liquefied natural gas storage and distribution facility.

Again I reference this poster, right here, this is 73 acres of that proposed LNG facility that I am talking about. When brought online, this facility would have the capacity to provide the needed heating oil for up to 35 percent of all New England households. Let me repeat that, the needed heating for up to 35 percent of all New England households.

It seems to me that this majority seems perfectly content to continue with flawed energy policy that prevents a major liquefied natural gas plant from being brought online, inevitably forcing them to later expand the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, to make up for New England's lost home heating ability. At a time when the domestic supply of energy sources is the most important issue in this country, the Democratic majority would rather stymie the growth of supply.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GINGREY. The Democratic majority would rather stymie the growth of supply through this bill than to allow us to debate meaningful legislation that would help hardworking American families out of this energy crisis.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose H.R. 415.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to reaffirm that the United States Coast Guard has found that the Weaver's Cove LNG proposal was unsafe. The Department of Commerce came to that same conclusion. On appeal, it came to that same